



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,720	12/28/2001	Earl J. Braxton	NMC104A US	2117
21133	7590	10/17/2005	EXAMINER	
VAN OPHEM & VANOPHEM, PC REMY J VANOPHEM, PC 51543 VAN DYKE SHELBY TOWNSHIP, MI 48316-4447			PHILLIPS, CHARLES E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3751	

DATE MAILED: 10/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/034,720	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BRAXTON, EARL J.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Charles E. Phillips	<b>Art Unit</b> 3751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5,7-10,12-15 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,9,14 and 18-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,7,8,10,12,13,15,17 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

Art Unit: 3751

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph has been rendered moot by the cancelation of "non-foldable" from the claims.

The examiner agrees with applicant's statement on page 26 regarding generic claims.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2,5,7,10,12,15,17 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahl taken with Tegg et al.

Dahl teaches a toilet shelter employing four walls which can be folded to a state best shown in Fig. 2 where adjacent walls lie superimposed. Lacking in Dahl is a base which is circumscribed by the side walls.

Tegg et al teach a knock down toilet where base 11 is employed and shown to be circumscribed by the sides of the unit. As both teach toilet enclosures it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan to provide Dahl with a base and roof cooperating with the sides as taught by Tegg et al, as the use of perfecting features of one device in the environment of another like device would have been prima facie obvious to the ordinary artisan in order to glean the properties of said features. Claims 12 and 21 are included here, as they are not separately argued for by applicant.

Alternatively it would have been obvious to provide for the use of the wall connection scheme of Dahl to replace the scheme of Tegg et al as the two would have

constituted obvious alternative disassembly schemes both shown used in identical art devices. The claim 5 "commode" is taught by Tegg et al at 53.

Claims 3, 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Braxton '836.

The latter teaches the use of rivets in col. 3, line 22, the use of which in Dahl would have constituted an obvious expedient known to the artisan.

The In re Jones test applied on page 16 of the arguments is deemed met in that the level of ordinary skill would reside well above that of placing a floor in a structural unit as defining invention. Regarding claim 21 , nothing here defines over the rejection supra .

The various states of folding argued for by applicant are nothing more than intended use states and do not define in this apparatus claim environment. Furthermore, Dahl is capable of attaining any folded state that the instant device can attain.

The sought after motivation to combine Dahl and Tegg et al lies in the fact that both teach knock down type portable privies. The argument regarding "substitute parts of one reference for parts of another "is" not well taken in that the proposal here is to provide one portable privy not having a floor, with a floor as taught by another portable privy. It is clear in the practice that a specific suggestion is not the test for a proper 103 rejection.


The state set forth for claim 17 is attainable by Dahl and the state in which the device is transported is nothing more than intended use, accorded no weight in this article environment.

Claims 4,9,14 and 18-20 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 2/24/03. The requirement is hereby made final.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Charles E. Phillips at telephone number 571-272-4893.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

  
**Charles E. Phillips**  
**Primary Examiner**